



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

**THE VICE-PRESIDENT:** Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

**MR. HALE:** Certainly.

**MR. WARREN:** I think the Senator from Maine, who is always fair, will agree with me that the army and, indeed, the navy are doing a great deal of work and service for this country aside from matters of war. For instance, take the rivers and harbors, which the Senator mentioned. All of that work is done under the supervision and direction of the army of the United States.

**MR. HALE:** Undoubtedly.

**MR. WARREN:** Take these outside matters, such as the Panama Canal, etc., the cleaning up of Havana, driving disease out of Cuba, etc. First, the discoveries as to how it all shall be done and then how to handle and do it, such as the extermination of yellow fever, etc., came from the army and army officers, and the execution of the work has largely been by them. Indeed, we had in San Francisco very lately an example of what the army is called upon to do.

The navy is engaged in certain surveys and certain duties. So it is hardly fair to say that the army and navy do not contribute in a quite large degree to the economics and industries of the nation outside of their regular duties in war.

**MR. HALE:** That is all incidental. The appropriations for rivers and harbors expended by the Engineer Bureau of the War Department are in another bill. I do not reckon them in these items of military expenditure, which aggregate such a vast proportion. It is undoubtedly the fact that the officers of the army and of the navy are accomplished men, educated men, and if we had a war they would be good fighters. But they all see but one thing, and that is the constant, ever-recurring, everlasting aggrandizement of their different departments.

## The Teaching of History in a Civilized Country.

BY DR. ERNST RICHARD.

In the September number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, there was a paper on "The Teaching of History," by Dr. Mowry which should not pass without commentary on the part of the friends of a better understanding between the civilized nations. It is not the fact that modern science has somewhat different views on the origin of civilization from those expressed in the introduction of the paper which calls forth the present remarks; nor can any fault be found with the second and greater part of the article based on the report of the Committee of Three of the American Peace Society.

But what shall we say of the eight "conclusive reasons" for the statement that "the history of our own country is the most important, the most useful and the most interesting history to be found in the annals of the world?"

There is no doubt that every child should know first of all the history of his own nation, and the first part of the first "reason" must be accepted without a challenge. But the second part of that first "reason" makes one hesitate. Have we a distinctly American chronology that makes much of our history "nearest to our own times?" Is it any nearer to our own times than the

history of any other nation of the last centuries? Or is it because our national organization is so much younger, so that a greater proportion of our history is closer to our own times than is the case with other nations? But even this would not warrant the superlative, for the national organization of the German empire is still younger: the whole of its history comprises only thirty-five years.

It is the use of the superlatives which makes the standpoint expressed in the eight "reasons" so absolutely antagonistic to everything the friends of international peace advocate and to everything that comprises true civilization. How disappointing is the whole statement after the author has told us, "The importance of any history is measured by what that history has done in promoting civilization, uplifting mankind, elevating humanity."

Let us suppose the truth of the eight "reasons" proven above any doubt. Let us assume that the American people really tower high above all other nations in achievements of civilization. What will be the attitude of the American citizen brought up in these opinions — I mean, not towards any proposed reform in his own irreproachable country, but towards progress? Will not his claim of superiority alone be offensive to all self-respecting nations? Will he not in all international disputes look upon the claims of other nations as an impudence on the part of an inferior people or race? Will not his whole attitude towards the sons of other nations be either snobbish or condescending, in any case, irritating? And this is to provoke a peaceful spirit, a willingness to let justice have its way! I mean, true, unbiased justice, not a justice that will say that by right the superior nation has a right to claim a somewhat exceptional position, — that its higher qualities give it also higher rights. Is it not exactly this view that is at the bottom of so many unjust wars? Is it not the spirit in which the English, as far as they were not directly interested in the capitalistic aspect of the enterprise, looked on the Boer war? Is it not exactly the spirit which at an earlier period of our history was characterized by the name "Know-nothing?" This manner of teaching history is certainly not the one to promote international solidarity. Or does Dr. Mowry suppose that the other nations will accept his "reasons" for American superiority?

Dr. Mowry says, "The advancement of our country has been more rapid than that of any other nation." What will he answer if he is asked, "In what does this advancement consist?" If towards democracy, has not Switzerland since the middle of the last century made much more rapid strides in this direction? Is not the Swiss constitution the only truly democratic one to-day? Have we advanced since the times of George Washington in those elements which represent the higher civilization perhaps more rapidly than the countries of Europe — than England, France or Germany? Is it not true that many of our fellow-citizens who want to acquire the highest culture find themselves compelled to go to Europe? And if to-day we may be able to acquire it here, is it not because it has been brought over by our own students, or by artists and scholars from the other side of the Atlantic? Indeed, if we compare the culture and scholarship of the society of George Washington's time with

that, let us say, of the time of Grant, and of contemporaneous society in Europe, does it not rather appear as if we had been lagging behind? Of many other questions which might be asked of Dr. Mowry, let me mention only one: How does our "more rapid" advancement agree with the tardiness in abolishing slavery?

As to the third "reason," that we have increased "the growth and broadening of our industries faster than has been the case with any other people," does Dr. Mowry not know of the growth of German industries during the last ten, aye, five years? As to the fourth point, does he not know of the development of knowledge, intelligence and learning in Europe when he claims that we have developed in this respect more rapidly than any other nation? It is impossible in the space of this article to treat extensively every point. But questions might be put like these: How does the illiteracy of native-born Americans compare with the percentages in Germany, Switzerland, Scandinavia? How the number of murders per thousand inhabitants here with that of all civilized nations? How about lynch justice? How about social legislation? And many others provoked by the expression of a national pride that forgets that superlatives always imply depreciation of the rest.

It is with great hesitancy that I have taken the pen to criticise an utterance of a deservedly eminent and well meaning educator like Dr. Mowry; but just because he holds such an influential position in his profession, his statements ought not to go unchallenged. The less so because many Americans, of whom he himself is an example, are brought up on these ideas without having, seemingly, the least suspicion of their erroneousness and the ridicule to which they expose their country with all broad-minded people at home and abroad.

No, my friends, it is not by the prayer of the Pharisee, elevating himself above the publican, that we gain the goodwill of others; it is not by teaching our children that they are far above those of all other nations that we make them treat international questions with fairness and imbue them with a respect for the rights of foreigners: but by teaching them that we owe the benefits of our civilization and culture to the combined effort of all nations; that no nation to-day has any advantage over the others, but that all work in common, according to their special gifts, for human progress and human solidarity; by teaching them that Moses was a Jew and Socrates a Greek, that Jesus was a Jew, Marcus Aurelius a Roman, Charles the Great a German as well as a Frenchman, Alfred the Great a Saxon, that Luther was German, that Calvin was French, Shakespeare English, Dante Italian, Corneille French, Cervantes Spanish, Goethe German, Descartes French, Hume English, Kant German, Raphael Italian, Dürer German, Rembrandt Dutch, Murillo Spanish, Thomas Payne English, Washington, Franklin, Jefferson American, Lafayette French, Steuben German, Whitney, Fulton, Morse American, Gutenberg German, Stephenson English, Galileo Italian, Copernicus German — why, there is no end of names, from all countries. Let us drop that ancient semi-barbarous kind of patriotism that only can feel great in belittling and irritating others.

Let us teach our boys to do their duty and work out their destiny in this beautiful land of ours for the progress of all mankind and its greatest ideals. Let us teach them that we owe everlasting gratitude to the other

nations for what they are doing for us, and that they are likewise under obligation for what we have done for them; that we must keep up with them in working for the general advancement, and that on the continuous exchange of these great goods the true civilization of the future, the solidarity of the human race, is founded, as it is symbolized by the lesser goods of commerce exchanged every day over the great connecting routes from land to land.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

## History of the American Peace Society and Its Work.

THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION  
AND PEACE.

The American Peace Society held its first meeting and adopted its constitution in New York City on the 8th of May, 1828, seventy-nine years ago. It moved its headquarters to Hartford, Conn., in 1835, where it stopped until 1837. It then transferred its work to Boston, where it has remained ever since.

The Society grew out of the movement which had begun as far back as 1809,\* and had culminated in 1815 in the organization of the first peace societies. The New York Peace Society, the first in the world, was organized in August, 1815; the Ohio Peace Society followed on the 2d of December; and the Massachusetts Society, founded by the venerable Dr. Worcester, in the study of Dr. Channing, on the 26th of December the same year. These societies were soon followed by others, and within a dozen years there were organizations in Pennsylvania, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Georgia and North Carolina, in addition to the three States just mentioned. The whole Atlantic seaboard section of the country, then a large part of the nation, seemed moved throughout, as by a common impulse, with the conviction that the moment had come for a serious united effort to abolish war and to establish among the nations in its place a system of rational pacific adjustment of controversies. A similar movement in Great Britain originating about the same time ran parallel with the American movement.

This first great wave of peace effort, which grew rapidly and spread in every direction, continued unabated for more than forty years, till the eve of the Civil War. It was an expression of the true spirit and aim of American principles and institutions. No proper account of it has ever yet been given. When the history of the country shall finally be thoroughly and scientifically written, it will be found to have been one of the most profoundly significant and influential movements known to our annals.

Back of the origin of the American Peace Society lay thirteen years of difficult pioneer work in the above-named States, led by David L. Dodge, Noah Worcester, William E. Channing, William Ladd, Josiah Quincy, Samuel J. May, Henry Holcombe and others, and soon participated in by men of prominence in every calling,

\*The first tract put forth in this country for the cause of peace was written in 1809 by David L. Dodge, a merchant of New York City, grandfather of the late William E. Dodge. The title of the tract was "The Mediator's Kingdom not of this world." It was in Mr. Dodge's parlor that the New York Peace Society, the first in the world, was organized in August, 1815, though the proposition to form one had been put forth by him in 1812. David L. Dodge is therefore rightly entitled to be called "The Father of the Modern Peace Movement."